

## **Implementing Model Programs in Schools**

**09/26/03**

**OPERATOR:** Good day, everyone. And welcome to today's Education Development Center Implementing Model Programs in Schools Conference Call. Today's conference is being recorded. Just as a reminder, all lines will be opened during today's presentation, so we ask that you please utilize your mute button when not speaking on the call.

For opening remarks and introductions, at this time, I would like to turn the conference over to Ms. Aurora Matzkin. Please go ahead, ma'am.

**AURORA MATZKIN:** Hi, everybody. This is Aurora Matzkin, from the Northeast Center for the Application of Prevention Technologies. Thank you for joining CSAP's Northeast CAPT Technical Assistance audio conference on Model Substance Abuse Prevention Program Implementation in Schools. This event is funded through SAMHSA's Center for Substance Abuse Prevention and the U.S. Department of Education Grant to Reduce Alcohol Abuse. First, I'd like to introduce Deborah McLean Leow, Associate Director of the Northeast CAPT.

**DEBORAH MCLEAN LEOW:** Good morning, everyone. I'd like to also welcome you to today's audio conference—both participants and panelists.

Today we have a distinguished panel of experts available to answer your questions about model program implementation in schools. This group includes university faculty and researchers, school principals, experts in model program dissemination, as well as school-based program implementers, and grants to reduce alcohol abuse sites from California, Texas, and New York.

We could spend the next two hours listing the accomplishments of our panel. But, instead, I will ask Aurora Matzkin to, briefly, introduce each panelist. Aurora?

**A. MATZKIN:** Hi, everybody, this is Aurora, again. First, I'm going to give a very brief introduction for each panelist we have today. We do have more complete biographies available on the audio conference web site. And I'll be listing that in a couple of minutes if you haven't found your way there, already.

We have a few different categories with people, as Deb mentioned. First, we have two experts from CSAP's Model Program Dissemination Project. The first is Ben Smith. Ben Smith has over 15 years of experience, using implementation technology, research, and evaluation to drive innovative solutions to complex problems. He has secured over \$12 million in federal funding for research evaluation and program development in substance abuse. His teaching publications and presentations are exemplary of his passion and commitment to good government, and new ideas in effectiveness of human services delivery systems.

Currently, Mr. Smith is the deputy director of Northbrook Health Solutions Services, in Rockville, Maryland, where he is responsible for assisting and overseeing major program components of the model programs dissemination project.

Second, we have Pamela Wilcox. Pam Wilcox has five years' work experience in health education and communications for contracts with the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, and the Substance Abuse and Mental Services Administration.

On the SAMHSA Model Programs Project, she worked, collaboratively, with program developers, representatives from the Center for the Application of Prevention Technologies, the Department of Education, and the National Registry of Effective Programs to market and promote evidence-based substance abuse and mental health prevention programs.

Pam, would you like to say hello to everybody this morning? Pam, we cannot hear you. Are you out there? Pam? No.

**OPERATOR:** Her line is open. Ms. Wilcox, please check your mute button.

**A. MATZKIN:** Maybe we have Ben Smith to say hello?

**BEN SMITH:** Yes, this is Ben Smith. Good morning, everyone.

**A. MATZKIN:** Pam, have you found your way back to us, yet? Well, we will give you a moment to introduce yourself in a little bit.

**PAMELA WILCOX:** Hey, Aurora?

**A. MATZKIN:** Yes?

**P. WILCOX:** Were you looking for me?

**A. MATZKIN:** Yes, I'm looking for you.

**P. WILCOX:** I was just doing sprints around the office trying to make sure that the other folks were able to get on the call. Hi, everybody. How's it going?

**B. SMITH:** Going real well.

**A. MATZKIN:** Thank you, Pam. Next, we have three GRAFT sites joining us.

From Patchogue, New York, we have Phil Olynciw. Phil Olynciw is manager of products and services for NIA Solutions Corporation. NIA provides training, technical assistance, and evaluation services to local school districts and community agencies for alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs, safety and comprehensive health initiatives. He is currently working with five OSDSS grants. He has an EdM in educational psychology from

Rutgers University, and was a special education teacher for 24 years. Phil, would you like to say 'hello' to everybody?

**PHIL OLYNCIW:** Hi. Welcome.

**A. MATZKIN:** Thank you, Phil.

Second from Patchogue, New York, we have Manuel Sansone. He is a principal, one of our administrators joining us today. He's the principal of South Ocean Middle School in Patchogue, Long Island, New York. The population of the school is 837 students. The school district was awarded an Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools Model Demonstration Grant in 1998, which resulted in the implementation of Dr. Gilbert Botkins Lifeskills Training Program, and an extensive peer-leadership initiative. South Ocean Middle School was identified by the Education Trust as a high-performing, high-poverty school, under its Dispelling the Myth Project.

Also joining us from Patchogue, New York is the evaluator for the Patchogue site, who is not, actually, *in* Patchogue, but in Pennsylvania. And that is John Swisher. Dr. John Swisher has an extensive background in policy analysis, the evaluation of substance abuse prevention programs. He is, currently, an evaluator for PM Cares with Patchogue-Medford School District, sponsored by the GRAFT, the U.S. Department of Education. These, and related research projects, have yielded approximately 100 articles and chapters in peer-reviewed publications, including recent work on cost benefit analysis of prevention programs. His publications have evolved to encompass a lifespan perspective, with articles ranging from preschool prevention through workplace prevention. Dr. Swisher, would you like to say 'hello' to everybody?

**JOHN SWISHER:** Hi. This is John Swisher. Good to be here.

**A. MATZKIN:** Thank you, Dr. Swisher. And Mr. Sansone, I did forget to ask you to introduce yourself. Could you do that?

**MANUEL SANSONE:** Good morning, everyone.

**A. MATZKIN:** We also have some folks joining us from the new Texas GRAFT site. First, we welcome Robert Jimenez.

**ROBERT JIMENEZ:** Hello?

**A. MATZKIN:** Hi, Robert.

**R. JIMENEZ:** Hi.

**A. MATZKIN:** Robert has over 10 years experience working with at-risk youth, both in a residential facility, and through the public schools. Presently, Mr. Jimenez is the program coordinator for New Braunfels Independent School District BLAST program.

This is a grant to reduce alcohol, through the Department of Education. Currently, BLAST is providing Lifeskills, Reconnecting Youth, Creating Lasting Family Connections, and he is in the process of adding Project Toward No Drug Abuse, and Parenting Wisely.

We were hoping that the principal at one of the schools that Robert Jimenez was with—Dr. Demetria Cummins—would join us this morning. But I do believe she is unavailable, unfortunately. We’ve scheduled poorly, and this is a school holiday, in Texas.

**R. JIMENEZ:** Well, just at the district.

**A. MATZKIN:** Our third GRAFT site is from California. Adam Valencia joins us. He has over eight years experience developing effective programs for youth. In his current role as project coordinator of Reconnecting Youth, Mr. Valencia oversees the Reconnecting Youth site, including the effective implementation of the curriculum and evaluation activities.

His prior experience includes the oversight of the Sierra Corps, and Sierra Heights Outdoor Education Program.

**ADAM VALENCIA:** Good morning!

**A. MATZKIN:** Welcome, Adam.

**A. VALENCIA:** Thanks. Good to be here. Yeah, thanks.

**A. MATZKIN:** Our final panel member, Tom Backer, will present, briefly, on program fidelity and adaptation. Tom is only able to join us for the first hour of this event. So if you have any questions for Dr. Backer, we do encourage you to ask them *early* in the event.

Tom Backer is a psychologist whose life work is devoted to helping people, organizations, and communities meet the challenges of innovation and change. Dr. Backer is the president of the nonprofit Human Interaction Research Institute. He is also an associate clinical professor of medical psychology at the UCLA School of Medicine. He’s the author of more than 400 books, articles, and research reports. Dr. Backer has studied and shaped substance abuse prevention programs for many years as part of his lifelong professional interest in dissemination and utilization of health innovations. Would you like to say ‘hello,’ Dr. Backer?

**TOM BACKER:** Good morning.

**A. MATZKIN:** Finally, in addition to that panel, one other Northeast CAPT consultant joins us. That is Carol Oliver. She helped to put the materials for this event together, and she joins us from Massachusetts. Thank you very much, Carol.

**CAROL OLIVER:** Thank you.

**A. MATZKIN:** Finally, we get to move to the meat of this conference call. First, is there anyone out there who had difficulty accessing the materials for this event? I know that there was some difficulty sending faxes to a few of you who have requested them. So I just want to make sure that everybody's accessed the web site, or received their fax. If you *haven't*, could you please speak up right now so I can go over where you can find these materials online?

I'm not hearing anybody. So, either you're talking to your mute buttons, or everybody managed to get the materials. Just in case anybody's having trouble, I'm going to, quickly, say how you can get these materials online. That is by going to the Northeast CAPT's website, which you can get to by going to [www.northeastcapt.org](http://www.northeastcapt.org). Once you get there, you'll be at our home page. And if you just put your mouse over the top menu bar, where it says 'services,' and then select 'technology,' and click on 'technology,' you'll then come up with a list of a few items. And if you click on 'audioconferences,' you will come to our main audio conference page. If you scroll down that page a little bit, you'll see a list of three different audio conferences. You click on the link for 'Implementing Model Programs in Schools,' you will get to this audio conference's website. Many of the materials we reference during this call will be available here. And if you have difficulty accessing anything at any point, please do let me know. Okay.

**D. MCLEAN LEOW:** Aurora? This is Deborah.

**A. MATZKIN:** Hi, Deborah.

**D. MCLEAN LEOW:** Can you remind folks to keep their buttons on mute? I'm hearing a typing sound in the background. So just a reminder to folks to keep your button on mute unless you are a speaker, or unless you're posing a question.

**A. MATZKIN:** Thank you, Deborah.

Before we move on to the presentation, we'd like to have each person joining the call to introduce themselves and let us know where you are from. If there's more than one person at your location, we'd *love* to have everyone say hello, briefly. The operator is going to prompt you, one at a time. Kathy is our operator. So go ahead, Kathy. If you could just start prompting people to introduce themselves now?

**OPERATOR:** Lois Agliata? Lois Agliata?

**A. MATZKIN:** Please remember to take your line off mute.

**LOIS AGLIATA:** I just had to find my mute button, again. [laughs] I'm sorry. Yes, I'm Lois Agliata, and I'm from Penn Yan, New York. I'm with the Council on Alcoholism. And I'm the education coordinator for Yates County.

**A. MATZKIN:** Wonderful. Thank you. Welcome.

**L. AGLIATA:** Thank you.

**OPERATOR:** Dennis Gleason?

**DENNIS GLEASON:** Hi, this is Dennis Gleason.

**OPERATOR:** I think he accidentally disconnected himself.

**A. MATZKIN:** I think we lost him.

**OPERATOR:** Corinne Mulhall?

**CORINNE MULLHALL:** Good morning. Corinne Mulhall. I am with the Madison County Council on Alcoholism and Substance Abuse, in Canastota, New York, which is in Central New York. I am the prevention education specialist here.

**OPERATOR:** Monteen Jackson?

**MONTEN JACKSON:** Good morning. I'm Monteen Jackson, from Fairbanks, Alaska. And I am the Safe and Drug-Free Schools coordinator for the Fairbanks, Northstarboro School District.

**A. MATZKIN:** And it is *really* early in the morning, there.

**M. JACKSON:** Yes, it is.

**A. MATZKIN:** Thank you for joining us so early!

**M. JACKSON:** Thank you.

**OPERATOR:** Jackie Kato?

**A. MATZKIN:** Jackie, are you out there?

**JACKIE KATO:** Yes, I am. Hello? Yes, this is Jackie Kato, and I'm with the Council on Alcoholism, the Ontario County Education Coordinator.

**A. MATZKIN:** Welcome.

**J. KATO:** Thank you.

**OPERATOR:** Susan Hunt?

**SUSAN HUNT:** Good morning. I'm Susan Hunt, from Glendale, California, with Glendale Unified School District. We're doing a teenage alcohol program, using the Project Success Model.

**A. MATZKIN:** Okay, thank you, and welcome.

**S. HUNT:** Thank you.

**OPERATOR:** Susan Sloan?

**SUSAN SLOAN:** Hi, I'm Susan Sloan from Chico, California. I'm an evaluator with Duerr Evaluation Resources. We're working with Vallejo Unified School District, and they're implementing T&D, and Project SUCCESS. And we're also working with other clients who are also implementing several model programs.

**OPERATOR:** Collette Stinar?

**COLLETTE STINAR:** Hi, I'm Collette Stinar. I'm from Great Falls, Montana. I'm the prevention specialist for Gateway Community Services.

**OPERATOR:** Kari Lynn Scott?

**KARI LYNN SCOTT:** Hello, I'm Kari Lynn Scott. I work for EMT. I'm based in our Los Angeles office. And I'm currently the project director for a statewide safe and drug-free school technical assistance project.

**OPERATOR:** Beth Lawyer? Beth Lawyer?

**BETH LAWYER:** Hi, I'm Beth Lawyer. I'm the prevention supervisor for North Star Behavioral Health Services, located in Malone, New York, right near the Canadian border.

**OPERATOR:** Karen Jensen?

**K. JENSEN:** Hi, this is Karen Jensen. I'm from the New Hampshire Department of Justice. I'm a program specialist, and I administer the Enforcing Underage Drinking Laws Grants, as well as the residential substance abuse treatment program.

**OPERATOR:** Lynn Kaltreider?

**LYNN KALTREIDER:** Good morning. My name is Lynn Kaltreider. I'm from Penn State University. I'm a collaborator on a NIDA-funded grant to evaluate a replication study of Project Alert to cooperative extensions.

**OPERATOR:** Doug Crevensten?

**DOUG CREVINSTON:** Yes, I'm Doug Crevensten, Director of Grants and Special Projects with the Fairbanks, Alaska School District, where it's 7 AM, and it snowed this morning.

**A. MATZKIN:** Oh, my goodness. Well, welcome. Thank you for joining us so early.

**OPERATOR:** Shai Fuxman?

**SHAI FUXMAN:** Hi. This is Shai Fuxman, from CSAP's Northeast CAPT. I'm a research assistant. I'm here with my colleague, David Cohen.

**DAVID COHEN:** Hi, there.

**OPERATOR:** Patricia Fallon?

**PATRICIA FALLON:** Patricia Fallon, Community Services Division, Healthways Regional Medical Center, Lubac, Maine. I'm a health educator. And we're working on Project Northland.

**OPERATOR:** Laura Minor?

**LAURA MINOR:** Laura Minor, Wheeler Clinic, Plainville, Connecticut. We just finished a state incentive grant using Smart Leaders, and we're trying to work on a curriculum for children affected by someone's substance abuse.

**OPERATOR:** Farrah Ahmad?

**F. AHMAD:** Hi, this is Farrah Ahmad. I'm with the SAMHSA Model Programs in Rockville, Maryland.

**OPERATOR:** Ann Weinheimer?

**ANN WEINHEIMER:** Good morning, this is Ann Weinheimer. I'm with the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools.

**OPERATOR:** Jennifer Allen?

**JENNIFER ALLEN:** Hi, I'm Jennifer Allen, from the SAMHSA Model Programs Dissemination Project in Rockville, Maryland.

**OPERATOR:** Laurie Regabeto?

**L. REGABETO:** Yes. I'm from the Substance Abuse Prevention and Counseling Program in Buffalo, New York.

**OPERATOR:** Marion Gage?



**MARION GAGE:** Hello. My name's Marion Gage. I'm with Butte County Office of Education, which is about a hundred miles north of Sacramento, California. I'm the health and safety coordinator, but I also am the coordinator for a grant to reduce alcohol abuse. And we are implementing a Project SUCCESS Towards No Drug Abuse and All-Stars. Thank you.

**OPERATOR:** Roblyn Letter?

**ROBIN LEUTER:** Good morning. This is Roblyn Leuter, and I'm a program associate with the SAMHSA Model Programs in Rockville, Maryland.

**OPERATOR:** And Jason Niles.

**J. NILES:** Hi, I'm Jason Niles. I'm a researcher with Channing Bete in South Deerfield, Massachusetts.

**OPERATOR:** And Ms. Matzkin, that's it.

**A. MATZKIN:** Thank you very much.

**D. GLEASON:** Hello?

**A. MATZKIN:** Is there somebody else?

**D. GLEASON:** Yes, this is Dennis Gleason with the Alcoholism Council in Niagara County.

**A. MATZKIN:** Great. Thank you. Did we miss anybody else? Wonderful. Well, thank you, everyone, for joining us. We *do* want to have an interactive discussion, today. Therefore, we'll leave your lines open for most of this call. In order to limit background noise, please *do* mute your phone when you're not speaking. I, actually, can hear that somebody's line right now is not muted. So if you could all check if your line's muted, we'd appreciate that. However, *do* feel free to jump in and ask questions at any time. We also hope participants will share their experience by answering *other* participants' questions. After Tom's presentation, we will pose the questions that were submitted, in advance, of the call.

For those of you who are following online, Dr. Backer's handout is online. If you have gotten to our website for this event, you can just scroll down to the resources section. And it's actually the first link underneath the resources section. It says 'Balancing Programs Fidelity and Adaptation for School-Based Programs.' And with that, please welcome Tom Backer.

**TOM BACKER:** Great. Thank you. Well, I have 10 minutes to cover 80 years of research about both program fidelity and adaptation, which we've been working on for

the last four years, for CSAP, and also the larger literature on program implementation. So I'm going to launch right into it. And then after the brief overview for the rest of the time that I'm available, I'll be glad to not only take questions, but also to hear what many of you on the *other* end of this call have to share of experiences that I *don't* have as a researcher. If you've actually been out there in your communities working on the implementation of programs, you have expertise that I don't have. And I'll be interested to hear what you have to say, as well.

But anyhow, let me start by giving you a quick walk through with the principles of effective implementation that come, not just from our work, but from the work of lots of other folks who've looked at the tortuous and difficult task by which programs actually get implemented out in the real world.

There seems to be—consistently, from all that research—four things that need to happen that increase the chances that a program will actually get implemented, successfully. I don't imagine this is going to be unfamiliar to anybody out there who's worked on the implementing of programs, but, perhaps, it's a good place to start this discussion just to remind us all what some of the basics are. And for those of you who are following along online, they're listed right at the beginning of my handout.

The first principle is about evidence. That you need to have evidence about an innovation's effectiveness, in order to persuade people to implement it out in the real world. And CSAP's National Registry of Effective Programs is one good information resource for that purpose.

Second, there needs to be communication about the innovation in user-friendly terms. The Northeast CAPT is just one of the organizations across the country in the CAPT program that can help with that task. And what that comes down to—which is something that I always need to keep in mind as a scientist—is that if you're trying to implement programs out in the real world, the description of them can't be written in science, or spoken in scientist jargon because that puts people to sleep. So it has to be in terms that are going to make sense to the people who have to do the work of change. And so that's a kind of translation problem that affects a lot of efforts to get programs moved from where they're invented, to where they actually get implemented out in the real world.

Third, that at the beginning, there needs to be a mobilization of both the human and financial resources that are necessary to implement the innovation. And the rule of thumb there is, actually, rather similar to the rules that all of us who are homeowners learned about making changes to our houses. That it will take twice as long, and cost twice as much as you ever estimated that it would. And that principle about the difficulty, whether it's literally twice as much, or some other figure is something that often gets missed in the planning for implementation—that it's costly, that the resources have to be there, or either the program needs to be scaled back, somehow, or resources, additionally, found to do the work. And that estimating process is an important part of the early planning for change.

Fourth, and finally—and of particular interest to me as a clinical psychologist by training, ‘cause that’s service—there needs to be an effort to deal with all of the *human* issues that are related to change. Everybody here on this call, from whatever perspective you come from, you’re all involved with change, in terms of helping to implement programs. And I suspect from the descriptions, there are many of you out either in the education or substance abuse systems. You know about the difficulties of change from the human side from actually *working* as classroom teachers, as substance abuse counselors. But change is hard, regardless of what the change is. And there are fears and resistances associated with change that *are* pathological. Not that people are sick, they’re just concerned about the changes that are going to be taking place, as a by-product of implementing a new program in any kind of an educational or community setting. And those fears and resistances need to be surfaced and talked about so that they can be dealt with.

On the other end of the spectrum, in order to make change happen, it’s essential to have an effort—as part of the change activity to get the new program implemented—to help people to feel ownership, involvement, to feel that it’s *their* program that they’re going to be working on to actually get it implemented on in the community. And without that kind of effort to enroll people to make them feel personally involved and that there’s some sort of reward—not just to their institution or community, but to *them* as individuals—for participating in the change effort, it’s much less likely that the implementation of the program will proceed, effectively. So, anyway, that’s a very quick work through of what science has to say on this subject.

In the short list of readings that’s also on my handout, the paper that I wrote a couple of years ago in the *Journal of Community Psychology*, which has the interesting title, “The Failure of Success.” That’s the shorthand for despite all the good evidence that we have about evidence-based programs *many* of them don’t work when they’re transferred out into the community, and why is that so? And that paper talks a bit more about the kinds of things that we’re discussing here. For anyone from education—if you don’t already know this resource—Jean Hall at the University of Colorado has written a book called, “Implementing Change,” which addresses the issues of change, and implementing new programs from the perspective of educational systems in a particularly useful way. There are several other pieces of writings that are mentioned there that can also help. If you want to have more background on this subject, you’re welcome to ask me about those things at whatever point along the way you’d like to.

To finish off on my 10 minutes here, I want to talk just a little bit about the charts, the second page of the handout—for those of you who are following along on that—which presents a process for balancing between program fidelity and adaptation. What we found in our research four years ago—for CSAP, about fidelity and adaptation—is that, in fact, *both* efforts are necessary to create successful programs in schools, school districts, and communities. There needs to be *both* a systematic effort to implement an evidence-based program with fidelity because if you *don’t* do that, there’s no assurance that whatever it is about the program that makes it *work* will actually work in your setting if it’s been changed so much that it’s not the original evidence-based model. But at the same time, virtually, *every* program in *every* circumstance has to be adapted in order to fit local

circumstances, and needs, and priorities, and resources, and also to help build that sense of ownership and involvement. Sometimes *simply changing the name* of the program is enough to begin that process of self-ownership. And there are other kinds of changes that have nothing to do with the content of the program, or its effectiveness, that can be made to help create a sense of ownership. And it's *those* kinds of adaptations that also turn out to be necessary in order for a program to be successful. So the term that we came up with, based on the research that we did—now several years ago for CSAP—was finding the balance between fidelity and adaptation. And it's to that process that that 12-step chart speaks that is in the second part of the handout that many of you have in front of you. And I just want to—read it for yourself—but I want to highlight a couple of steps in the chart, as I wrap up talking with you today.

The first one that I want to mention, in particular, is Step Number 3. To answer questions like, *'How much is it going to cost to implement? How much adaptation will be necessary in order to make a program work in a particular setting?'* And if the answer to that question is so much adaptation that it may run the risk of making the program less successful, less able to do whatever its evidence-base permits, then either the issues that require that adaptation need to be explored so that maybe less adapting will be necessary. Or, perhaps, a different program needs to be selected. One of the big mistakes that we found in our research that implementers often make in moving programs out into the real world—in different places than where they were, originally, tested and researched—is in making adaptations that, in fact, are necessary in order for the program to move into a new environment. But adaptations that are so significant that the program really can't work. And so the choice may be, in fact, to pick a different program. And that's what a review at the beginning can help to establish.

And a second and final step in that process that I'm going to highlight—here, you read the rest of them for yourselves—is the necessity to document what's done in promoting the balance between fidelity and adaptation. And I think, in a sense, that's the most important thing that I want to leave you with today, in terms of what science can contribute to fidelity and adaptation, challenges, and how to wrestle with them out in the real world of implementing programs. That's the most important single thing one can do to increase the chances that a program will work in a new setting, is to document *what happens* so that if there are problems, you can go back and look at what went wrong, figure out how to fix it so that you're beginning to build the base for later evaluation, perhaps for using an evaluation tool like CSAP's Pathway to Effective Programs and Positive Outcomes. To be able to use—for purposes of fidelity and adaptation—a fidelity instrument like the process that the Northeast CAPT has put together one of the publications that's listed in my short list there. Assessing program fidelity and adaptations speaks to that particular process quite well, I think.

The point is you gotta know what's happened in order to be able to go back and do adjustments, tinkering, making fixes when they're necessary, and that documenting process throughout the stages of implementation of a program gives you the ability to continue to look at program implementation as it moves along so that you can make the

adjustments that are necessary in this complicated process of taking an evidence-based program and putting it into place in a new setting.

And that's what I have to say by way of opening, at this point. Do we want to take some comments or questions? Or move along? I'm turning it back over to our moderator now.

**A. MATZKIN:** Thank you, Dr. Backer. Why don't we go ahead and take comments or questions about the presentations? If anybody has anything, just go ahead and speak up.

**P. OLYNCIW:** This is Phil, from Patchogue, New York. My question is around the adaptation piece and the due diligence review. What process would you go through to determine how much adaptation is too much, or whether a particular adaptation involves such an essential element that it would cause the problem to be ineffective? Do you have a process that you go through to determine that?

**T. BACKER:** Yes. It's a fairly complicated process, probably more in the details of it than we can go into in this conference. In the resources that are listed in the handout, there are two ways that you can get more about that, both in terms of what's said in the literature—because we did a literature review—and also a manual that we're putting together under CSAP's sponsorship for how implementers can deal with these issues. And as it says in the handout, if you'd like to get early access to that, you can get a copy, which we also hope you might review and give us some feedback on 'cause it's not yet finalized. But that lays out the details of each of those 12 steps.

Now, not to weasel out of giving you some answer here, right now on the phone. Some of the basic steps involved in doing that are do begin by looking at the program and what are its—in using science jargon—its core components? That is the half dozen or so things that make the program what it is. That you can determine, in part, from the description of the program from its developer, by a kind of common sense analysis of why did you select this particular program? What did you think about this program was going to help you with whatever are the substance abuse concerns and needs in your particular community? And to focus, then, on what you need to implement of that program in order to get the effects that you're looking for. I know that sounds, you know, thunderously; obvious when I say it. But our observation has been—looking at a lot of implementations out in the field—that that often gets *lost* in all of the mechanical issues around implementation. So starting by identifying, clearly, what are the essential elements of the program? And what are you expecting it to do so that you can kind of rope off parts of the program that you *mustn't* tinker with very much because they have to do with why you chose the program to begin with.

And it also, in many cases, is useful to have an interaction with the developer. Some developers have very explicit materials that address this subject. Lynn McDonald's staff, for example, has a whole manual on what can you adapt, and what you can't. And Lynn has been very clever in identifying and *labeling*, rather clearly, all of the things about her program that you can adapt. And they have to do with the circumstances of administration, and timing, and a variety of things that in her research, she's determined

can be changed without affecting the basic effectiveness of the program. And then she also has some elements of the program that she cautions you *not* to change because to do so would be likely to render the program ineffective.

So start by looking at why you selected the program, what is it going to do for you, and roping off those areas as *least* open to adaptation.

And, secondly, having *some* kind of interaction, either with the informational materials from the developer that help you to understand the program, or, *ideally*, an interaction with the developer or their representatives, themselves, so that you can talk about what you're doing.

And last item—and this pertains, I think, *particularly*, to the value of conference events like the one that we're on right now—talk to people who have actually implemented the program. I'm a great believer—as a professional—in the value of peer consultation. And if I were in the shoes of a lot of the folks who are on the line today who are implementing programs, the first thing that I would do—after I'd understood something about the program, myself, and maybe had some sort of preliminary interaction with the developer—is that I'd want to find somebody who looked like me, that is, who's in a setting somewhat similar to mine, who has implemented this program themselves, and talk to them about how they dealt with adaptations that were necessary in their community. I am a *strong* believer in peer-to-peer consultation. It's not that the scientists and the developers don't have something to say. I think they do. But in the end, finding somebody whose implementation experiences you can learn about and piggyback on in your own efforts to implement, I think makes an enormous difference.

**M. GAGE:** This is Marion Gage. Being one of those people out in the field, what you've described feels like a very daunting task. And I think it's true what you're saying in the reality is that when you try to implement in the field, there are going to be needs for adaptations. I think it would be a very useful tool if more developers did what you described. My experience is with at least three programs, when you ask the developers whether their core elements, what they really don't want to have adapted, they *can't* tell you that. They say the program, the way I wrote it, is how it needs to be done. So my experience is—especially with two, out of the three—that there wasn't a whole lot of flexibility. The message was you *have* to implement the program exactly as we have written it. So that puts us—at least in the field—in a bind.

And the other issue that I found is often it was very difficult to get a real sense of the program or curriculum until you've gone through the training. And then, unfortunately, you're in the training, you've made the investment of the training, and then you're *really* getting a clear picture of what this program's about, what the developer really wants you to do, and you're going, oh, oh! And then you start the negotiation process, and, quite frankly, I've had some knock down, drag outs with folks, you know? And so, in the field, you feel like you've done your best to read the descriptions, had some initial conversations, invest in the training of the program, and then you find out a lot more than you didn't know you needed to know. So those of us in the field, and especially in my

situation—I'm in a rural county, I wear lots of hats—to get involved in the 12 steps, they're great, but they look like I'm going to be in the process of many programs and I try to do any kind of adaptation that I'm almost back into a science replication. So that's just my initial response. It's a little overwhelming.

**T. BACKER:** Yes, and believe me, you're not the first person—in reviewing the materials that we've been putting together these last couple of years—who's said exactly that. We're in the process right now, through interactions like this, through some focus groups, of trying to figure out the best ways to simplify the approaches that we're suggesting so that they meet the needs of people like yourself who are implementing programs out in the real world. And, also, have heard about some developers that that's the approach that they take. And as a scientist, I have to tell you, there's one point of view—and this is why finding the balance is such a tricky thing—there's one point of view that certainly has to be mentioned here, which is, simply, that nobody, *nobody*, has done the research necessary, yet, to determine from a scientific standpoint what are the core components, and what you can add, or delete, or change, and what impact that will have. There *is* no evidence-based program that's done that. That's called component validation research. And the National Institute on Drug Abuse has, just recently, funded some research studies that will start to look at that issue, and the results aren't in, yet. So everybody's kind of guessing.

What we've got now, are, essentially, black boxes where, you know, everybody can have their educated guesses. And I'm not saying that the developers, the scientists who've invented these programs don't have some pretty good guesses about what's most essential, but, you know, frequently, people who are trained in science are reluctant to share their guesses until there's some research data behind them. At the same time, I think the process that I suggested about identifying *individuals* who have implemented programs that, in circumstances somewhat similar to yours, is the best way to balance the input that you get from a developer and from the developer's materials.

Now, those of us who are working in this area all the time are pushing developers to be more specific, to provide more information. In some cases, the reality is that they don't, necessarily, have, from science, more specific information to give, in which case, we're all kind of in the process of figuring out, if you will, what to do until the doctor comes. And that's where I think the value of peer networking is so great because in the end, in order to implement programs at all, it is axiomatic in almost every circumstance that some adaptations are going to have to be made. And if that's the case, then using that guesses, incomplete evidence, the opinions of people who've had similar experiences. *But*—and here's the key, and this is where these steps come back in—doing all of that guessing, and estimating, and gathering opinions in a systematic way so that you've collected information about what you've done, whom you've heard from, and what kinds of actions you're taking as a result, that's the documenting part of it. And I know it looks daunting. I mean, it *is* a challenging process. I'm not going to deny that. In one sense, it's easier for me, as a researcher, to kind of stand back and look at it, than it is to actually do it on a day-to-day basis. So I just want to acknowledge that the difficulty of the process—and yet, with that documenting, you stand the best chance of being able to figure out *how*

to implement the program with incomplete evidence, with a lot of guess work so that the chances for success are the great possible, and, particularly, when you use a systematic method for measuring the *outcomes* that you achieve from implementing a program. If you're getting good *outcomes*, then you have some reason to believe that, however rough and approximate your process was of implementing the program, that you did something right, 'cause you're getting good results. And if you *don't* get good results, then you can go back and look over the documentation that you've got, and try to figure out what's gone wrong, and how to fix it. And so I guess the balance here is that by making the up front investment in getting all the information that you can—incomplete as it may be—and documenting what you do, I *do* think that you increase the odds of successful implementation. But I, you know, I think your points are really well taken. And my guess is that if we went around to *every* implementer who's on the line today, we would hear somewhat similar experiences that others have had. And it *is* a difficult process, and there *aren't* any easy solutions. The two that we found that seem to make the most difference are getting input from as many places you can—developers and other implementers, and documenting what you do.

**K. SCOTT:** Dr. Backer, this is Kari Lynn Scott, from ENT in California. You've kind of started to tap into this in some of your responses. But the steps that you've outlined really focus around the local implementer's role, in terms of finding the balance between fidelity and adaptation. And I was wondering if you could comment on what you see the ideal role of the model developers, in terms of that process?

**T. BACKER:** That's a great question. I think the answer to that question, to some extent, already has been given by the individual who spoke, previously, that developers, paying more systematic attention to the issues of fidelity and adaptation, providing more substantial information. I mean, frankly, there *are* models for how to do this. And I keep coming back to Lynn McDonald and the FAST Program because, to me, that's the gold standard of what exists in the field, now. It isn't that there aren't other *very good* evidence-based programs.

**[END OF SIDE A]**

**T. BACKER:** I'm not meaning that they have done a *particularly* good job of investing in creating materials. Now, that said, there's another issue here that needs to be brought up. And I bet if I don't do this, somebody else will get right on the line from the implementer's side. Lynn McDonald's *process* for implementing a program is expensive. There's a lot of training that goes into it. The training is provided by a non-profit organization that she started, so they're not out there to make a bunch of money from it. But *it is costly*. And, you know, in the end, there's an up front decision that I think has to be made about any kind of program implementation that there *will* be an investment necessary to do it right. And to put it very bluntly, if there's *not* the resources available to do it right, then you probably shouldn't implement the program at all. Because the *poorly* implemented program will suck up resources in the community, give the *appearance* of making a difference in substance abuse prevention, but won't really accomplish anything. So for developers to do more along the lines of manuals that relate to fidelity and



adaptation, laying out what are the core components, and *being willing to talk about the realities*. One of the anymore *not-so-hidden* secrets about even some of the best evidence-based programs that we have—and I won't name names here, but keep it in the abstract—when you look at the fine print in their own scientific research about those programs, what they *call* a “high-fidelity implementation” is, sometimes, 80 percent, sometimes only 60 percent of the program being implemented. That's what the *developer's* saying is really the level of fidelity in the implementations that they study in their research. And, you know one of the things that I've often said in giving public lectures on this subject is to look around in the audience and say, ‘Okay now, in your own marriage relationship, would you accept 60 percent fidelity as the standard for proceeding?’ It gets a laugh, but it also makes the point that, in fact, the *standard* for fidelity—even in scientific research on this subject—is not quite the pristine, pure that you would expect, and that's the *good* news because remember that what I'm talking about is the level of fidelity that, nonetheless, results in *significant* impact of these programs, as measured by well-controlled science. So I guess if I had to make a plea, if there were a bunch of developers on the line here—and I've said this, and, you know, had interesting discussions with developers over the years on this very subject—that *if* developers were more able to step up to the plate and really talk *directly* about the kinds of adaptations that, either they're evidence, or they're best guess as the developer of the program would say could be made, that would probably improve the state of practice in the field.

And last point, if that process is to occur with the whatever the exact number is right now—the 50-some model programs in CSAP's National Registry of Effective Programs—somehow, some third party, whether it's CSAP or some other funding agency, is going to have to come up with some resources that many developers don't have on their own to *assist them* in creating those materials. I mean, there's the kind of public policy issue here that if we're trying to advance the cause of implementing programs effectively, in the end, some *public* investment will need to be made in creating the information materials and the strategies for being able to adapt programs in whatever reasonably effective way is possible until the research gets done that tells us, scientifically, how to do it. And that's probably—the research part of it—is probably 5–10 years in the making, and it may *never* happen for some programs. So it's not only the developers who have a responsibility here, but also funders, certainly people doing the work of implementation have the responsibility to *educate* themselves as much as they can, and I'll just say it one more time, to talk with others who are doing this work so that they can capitalize on shared experiences about how to do it right. I think we've all got a part to play in improving this and in addressing some of the challenges that you folks on the other end of this conversation have already been well pointing out.

**L. MINOR:** Dr. Backer, I just wanted to make three quick points. This is Laura Minor from Connecticut, and, again, our SIG is just over, very successful. However, there are very few funders out there who will *continue* a successful program. Number One, you have to come up with something *new* to get new funding.

Number Two, we had lots of money through this program, which paid for our transportation of kids after school, which our school system doesn't pay for outside evaluation and those kind of things. A lot of that is no longer available because of our economic situation. We don't have the money for the *kinds* of incentives that were used, initially, in some of the research for evidence-based programs, but you could pay families huge amounts of money, versus what reality in some of the smaller grants.

And, lastly, the human connection. If I have a wonderful person who is running a program, who connects with children in an amazing way—I hate to say this, but if she uses less of the program with its fidelity, it's going to work, anyway, versus a person who *can't* connect with kids, who does everything exactly to tow the line. And I'll mute myself, again.

**T. BACKER:** The resources points that you've mentioned, everybody on the line, I expect, could present similar stories about the challenges of limited resources. I wish I had a magic solution for the difficulties that you just mentioned, but I don't. And all I can say is that for the solution of those problems, or *partial* solution, I would come, once again, to the value of networking with peers to try to identify clever solutions that at least help *a bit* to close that gap. But those are real problems that there is no easy solution for.

I think you've made a very important point, though, in your last statement, that developers are, frankly, paying much more attention to them than was the case even just a couple of years ago in the research that's being done now about these evidence-based programs. It is very unlikely we will *ever* invent a program—for any kind of intervention, whether it's substance abuse prevention or something else—that is going to be so rigorous, so good in its own components that it isn't going to rely, very heavily, on the qualities, and the determination, and the commitment of the individuals who are implementing it. And that's one of the reasons that paying attention in the implementation process to the human dynamics of the change that you're trying to effect so that you get the best people engaged and *keep them on board*—'cause one of the great problems is that people move on, they lose interest, the folks who are the best at implementing a program may not stick with it unless there's attention paid to how to keep them motivated to be involved. And as more research is done about the *quality* of implementation of programs, what we're finding out, time and time again, is that exactly the portrait that you just mentioned, of the enthusiastic, and skilled individual implementer has a lot to do with success. Now, I would say that the evidence-based program isn't irrelevant there. If you've got a terrific person implementing a crummy program, that also is not going to lead to success. But given that you've got a program that works reasonably well, the variable that's probably under your greatest control—if you have any choices about good people to do the implementing work—is to try to *find* that enthusiastic individual that you just profiled. Because that seems to have a disproportionate effect on the effectiveness of the program, that they're not person-free, so to speak. And even with all the research that's been done to make them effective, they *still* take good people to implement them.

**J. SWISHER:** This is John Swisher. I wanted to raise a couple of questions. One thing I'm missing here in this conference call is all the heads nodding out there in the field, with some of the comments, both from Tom and from people calling in. I think there's probably a lot of agreement, a lot of concern about core components and so on.

One of the things I've observed is that what we know from psychology, Tom, is to produce schizophrenia, you give people contradictions. You give them conflicting instructions all the time. And it seems to me that fidelity and adaptation are some of those conflicting instructions. Fidelity means 'exactness.' I looked it up, recently. And adaptation means 'change.' And what we really need to do is say fidelity's on one end of the *continuum* of adaptation. And creative innovation is on the other end of that continuum. We can't really put fidelity and adaptation in the same *phrase* because they really mean different things. And you're absolutely right, Tom, we don't know what the core components are, what you can adapt and not adapt, and so on. And in the GRAFT Program, we're trying to implement with fidelity, to the extent possible.

Another question I wanted to address to Tom is when we move down that continuum of adaptation, then we have to go to "core components." And if everything's core, then that's more of that schizophrenia. But we could go to principles of best practices. And I'm wondering, Tom, if you could comment on how *principles* of effectiveness and prevention could help guide us, like beginning early, and things of that sort.

**T. BACKER:** Well, I think they can certainly help in analyzing a program to look at what its core components are—however roughly that's estimated—with respect to the goals for implementing a program that exists in a particular school, or school district, or community.

The *limitation* of principles is that by their nature, they are general. They don't pertain to *one* particular program. And at some point, that transition is going to have to be made to '*What is it about this particular program that represents an example, or an instance of a prevention principle?*' As, John, I'm sure you know Steven Shenke at Columbia University has done a very thoughtful analysis of the principles for effective prevention in the model programs that are in the NREPP collection. And I think that's been in our writings about fidelity and adaptation, we include the roster of principles that he's come up with because I think it's a great *learning* tool and *discussion* device. But in the end, you really don't have an alternative to go down to the particular program that you're going to be implementing. And there's some point at which those principles are going to have to be translated into the particulars of that programs, and that's going to be a rougher process because Steven Shenke's analysis was done on a whole bunch of programs, rather than just on one. And that, in the end, means that anybody who's implementing a program is going to be required to make some translations. And that will be an approximate process. And by the way, that's what everybody else is doing, too, including the scientists. I think there's an *unhelpful* tendency that's sort of built into the acculturation that scientists get to think of what we're doing is separate from the rest of the world. But, in fact, with my statistic about how much of evidence-based programs in the research that developers do tend to get adapted because that's what's required to

make programs work out in the real world. There isn't as much of a separation between the scientists and the implementers as there might seem to be. But there is a process of, frankly, using professional judgment. And until we have the exact science—which may be a long way off, if it ever gets here—that's what we're all going to be concerned with.

**A. MATZKIN:** We have come to the end of the hour that Dr. Backer is able to spend with us. And I want to thank Dr. Backer very much for doing this presentation, and answering some questions.

**T. BACKER:** Well, thank you. I appreciate the opportunity to be part of the call. I'm sorry I can't stay on for the rest. But I invite anyone who would like to get a copy of our draft guidelines—both for your own use, and also to give it some editorial input—to contact me. My e-mail address, as well as phone number, if you want to be old-fashioned about it, is on the handout that you have. And, also, if there are questions that someone on the call had that you'd like to address to me that you can't now because I have to leave to, actually, go to another conference call, I'd be happy to hear your question by an e-mail or a phone call so that I can try to answer it. And I also want to thank everybody else who spoke up for the good input that you made. This is still a learning process for me, as a researcher. And every time I interact with people who are out there in the field *doing* the work of program implementation, I learn something from it that helps me to do a better job of supporting the work that you're doing. I just wanted to acknowledge that, as well.

**A. MATZKIN:** Thank you, very much. We do still have a tremendous panel of experts here with us. There were a few questions that were submitted in advance of the call. Some of these, we've already addressed, to some extent. But there are a few follow-up questions, and some of them I *do* want to make sure that we get to. The first was a question about general program about adaptation and fidelity, which I think that Dr. Backer has addressed, to some level. But from the GRAFT sites and the implementers that are on the phone, the follow-up to this question is, '*Are there costs involved with adaptation? And is it a lengthy process?*' I thought it would be helpful to hear from some of the implementers who are on our panel, and also participating in this call about how you've experienced adaptation in your community.

**A. VALENCIA:** This is Adam Valencia from Tulare County in California. Those two words are what we have to live by out here in Tulare County. I think we all have to live by those two words—fidelity and adaptation. I think the real special think about our county is that we spend a lot of time—our program, Reconnecting Youth—has spent a lot of time in going out and establishing relationships. But keeping it in mind with my staff is we're making sure that we're making this program work for that school site. What I mean by that is we are establishing our relationships. We're figuring out what their needs are within their school, and that has been very helpful for us. It really goes back to the relationship building. And many of our sites have been very receptive for Reconnecting Youth. We've extended our programs. And our county is a pretty good size county. But I think the real key thing is once you start working with your school districts, and you really try to find out what their needs are, you know, begin demonstrating what the

program can actually do for their school, you know, we've had a real good response in Tulare County. So we've been fortunate.

**A. MATZKIN:** Thank you, Adam. Robert Jimenez, you want to give some perspective from Texas?

**R. JIMENEZ:** Yeah, first of all, I second what Adam said. But, also, what we experience here is the program was brought in, really, by people at the administrative level of the school district, without really checking, or getting too much input from principals, and teachers, and things like that. So when we came in, a whole lot of people didn't know what we were going to be doing, and how we were going to go about doing it. So the topic of adaptation was a big issue because if you talked to the developers, they want to just straight by the book. And then when you talk to the schools, well, you can't do that. It doesn't work that way. So what we've done is we've adapted the program with as much fidelity as we're able to do. But at the same time, the kids come to school, since we're in the school, the kids come to school, you know, we've got to put that first. So we've just been as flexible as we possibly can. And I'm talking to developers as often as I can just to ask them well look, we're trying this. This is my problem. This is what I'm up against. And they'll give me options.

Also, I talk to other programs that are doing the same thing just to see kind of how they've overcome those challenges. But I encourage everybody, most developers are available to help problem-solve. And there's really very few that I've talked to that have just come out and said, well, you have to do it this way. Most of the time, they'll give you options and solutions to different challenges. So I would encourage people that are having problems with adaptations to get in touch with the developers. I mean, it's their baby. They're the ones that can really give a lot of input on how to overcome challenges.

**M. GAGE:** This is Marion, again, in Butte County. Let me give you a specific example of where we're struggling with this adaptation question. It comes around, in terms of evaluation. So one of the programs, actually, two of the programs—when we got into the nitty gritty of looking at what they wanted to do for evaluation—was an extensive questionnaire that would require parent permission, to pull off. In California, we have a required Healthy Kids Survey that got out a lot of the same data. *But*, it also required the parent permission. So we're in the process of negotiating, can we use that data, which is only a bi-annual, every other year survey, instead of your questionnaire. So that's where it gets a little tricky, in terms of the evaluation piece. And one of the programs is kind of giving me the response back well, once you ask parent permission, you can do our survey, too, which I don't think is true. And so the whole burden of how to *do* the evaluation is what's hitting us. And, again, not clear, again, the evaluation feels like that we're being asked by the developers to replicate their science, to a certain extent. So I guess that's a struggle that we're having now, in terms of that's an adaptation we're having to try and adapt what they are requesting us to do for evaluation. And what we're already in the process. And so that conflicts with what we wrote in to our grant how we were going to evaluate the program. So that's just an example of one of the struggles we're having with adaptation specific to evaluation. That's just one piece.

**A. MATZKIN:** Dr. Swisher, I'm wondering if you could respond a little bit to the challenge of multiple evaluation instruments.

**J. SWISHER:** That is tricky. And, in fact, we're going through that right now with one of the Patchogue projects. Not *this* one, in particular, but schools are, and states are now engaging in annual or every other year surveys of related behaviors, if not *same* behaviors. And if there's any way that can be used in evaluation, I would do that. I would not burden the schools, or the kids with more data collection. Less is better, in many cases.

The human subject question you raise, I think, technically, you're correct. If you get parental permission for *a* survey, you can't, then, generalize it to other surveys. You'd have to go back and get it for *your* specific one. Or the next time you go around on parental permission, put it a couple others that you may be anticipating. And then, finally, one thing you might consider is if you could do that health survey that you do every other year, if you could do it *every* year, then that might improve your evaluation, as well.

If you could also add to it, *in* one of those years, a couple of the *pieces*, not the whole survey, but a couple of the *pieces* that, again, we'll go back to core components, what's *core* in the evaluation, and what's *core* in the program. But you might be able to pull out a couple of pieces that are missing from your statewide survey. But those are just some suggestions for how to wrestle with that.

**P. OLYNCIW:** This is Phil, from Patchogue, and this responds to that question about the *cost* of adaptation, or achieving fidelity. And, especially, in regard to some of the pieces that Dr. Backer said about dealing with the human issues, and bringing all the folks together to discuss what types of changes are needed, or just dealing with the human elements of change is that getting people together to discuss adaptation, getting people together to impact them about what type of program is going to effect within a school district. At times, in our case, involves the *payment* of those people to be there. So if you just look the cost of a Reconnecting Youth Program, or ATLAS and ATHENA program, and the training that's associated with it, you have to go a bit beyond that when you start talking about getting people involved, and getting their ownership, and getting their buy-in, and engaging them in adaptation procedures because they need to be *paid* for that time in our, particular, circumstances, like union paying of teachers for union for additional, professional development time which is not, already, built in because these are additional programs that have been put on and increased teachers' workloads. So when we have a grant, we have to re-think that whole issue of additional training, of teacher release time, of paying for substitutes. So when you look at what the cost of a program is that a developer puts out, you really have to go *beyond* that, and take a look at what the cost is going to be to bring those people together, sometimes to rent space, to get additional trainers on-site. So I would say, especially, some of the elements that Dr. Backer has, it *is* a costly procedure.

**A. MATZKIN:** Thank you, very much. Does anybody have a related question? We do have a few more questions that were submitted in advance of the call.

**J. SWISHER:** This is John Swisher. I just want to add a little bit to what Phil just said. And, in particular, one of the strategies that Phil has used in developing grants and so on is to have *in the grant* an on-site person who helps implement programs, but, also, who helps monitor that implementation. That person's also available to the school as a sub, in crises, and that makes it a real good deal for the school, to have somebody they can turn to if they really need them. But it's an approach that's been very effective. It's also given us data about the implementation, and its variance across schools, and allows us, then, to look at our research data and say, well, this dynamic going on in the school—which, may very well be, and in one case, was a very negative dynamic—we can say, well, that really accounts for why that school wasn't up to snuff, compared to the other schools.

**A. MATZKIN:** Thank you, very much. Does anybody want to ask a related question? Okay, why don't I open it up, because we do have less than an hour less for folks to ask other questions on their minds. No? We still have a full list of questions that people submitted ahead of time.

**B. SMITH:** Hi, this is Ben Smith.

**A. MATZKIN:** Hi, Ben.

**B. SMITH:** I just wanted to make kind of an observation and a comment. Dr. Backer kind of pointed two areas that he focused on. One was the due diligence area, and the second was documentation.

So I was just kind of reflecting back on, in a community, how this would fit in a community around first conducting a needs assessment. And then going from your needs assessment to selecting a program, implementing that program, and then evaluating that program as kind of a framework. And what had occurred to me is that what he's talking about in his due diligence review is not just a discreet activity. It's more of an ongoing activity, and that this due diligence process that he's talking about appears to be, it's much more than just a needs assessment. It's a needs assessment, and then a kind of taking that and laying the needs assessment out and trying to select programs that would address your prioritized needs in your community.

And then, not only selecting some programs that address those prioritized needs, but, really, kind of kicking the tires, so to speak, to see if it's really going to fulfill what you've identified in your community.

At Model Programs, we are working to collect more detailed information about what it takes, what infrastructure is required in a community to implement a specific program. And we hope to be posting that information on the web site, sometime in the near future.

Then beyond that, when you implement a program, there *are* going to be adaptations. You're going to be facing things that are outside of your control, in your community, or in your school that you're going to have to make some modifications to the program. I think they need to be painted, not in a negative sense that we've got to change the program, but that it's an enhancement. Because the change that is being made is being made to fit your particular community. A professional judgment that is being made—those judgments that are being made of how changes will be made to the program—are being made in the best interest of serving the kids in your community.

And so that brings me to the point of the documentation. I think that we need to be careful not to spend enough time focusing on process evaluation. We need to spend more time focusing on process evaluation so that we can capture those changes that were made. And that will help us to *explain* the outcomes that we receive, but also will help in the replication of that modification for similar communities. Because you may have peers—and as Dr Backer was referring to the conversation among peers is very valuable—peers and peer communities may also face some of the same challenges in implementing the program. And if you've captured some of that information through a process evaluation—this is how it was changed, and this is what we did, and then that can help to explain your particular outcomes—then other folks can benefit from that, as well. And I'm remembering back at the second TA meeting for the GRAFT awardees, that down in—I believe it's in Alabama—they were facing a similar situation in a particular community there is having to modify a program. They were doing an extensive process evaluation on their own because they are going to replicate that program, I think, in other communities, and they're going to be facing some of the similar challenges.

So I think the two points he brought out—due diligence review and the documentation—are just two very key issues that need to be addressed.

**A. MATZKIN:** Thank you.

**S. SLOAN:** This is Susan Sloan, from Chico, California. While some curriculum developers are really open with providing information on their curriculum, we ran into a situation, yesterday, where one of our clients chose a particular model program. And we can't even get a copy of what the curriculum looks like without purchasing it. And it would be nice if there were some kind of a standard, communication standard for curriculum developers who have model or exemplary programs, and what they should be providing to people who are interested so that a due diligence review *can* be done, and you *can* select a program that really fits.

**A. MATZKIN:** Pam, or Ben, could you talk a little bit about that?

**B. SMITH:** Yeah, that's key information. And I think that kind of a like version—if we could use a software term—that would allow someone to take a quick review is something that could be very valuable.



**S. SLOAN:** That would really be excellent, because it would really help the clients in the field who are looking at the curriculum, or the evaluators who are reviewing curriculums. This particular curriculum would've been *perfect* to meet their local needs. But because there wasn't an open dialogue with the curriculum developer—it looks like an excellent program, and their outcomes are excellent, but there's just not this open line of communication.

**D. MCLEAN LEOW:** Do you mind sharing with us what program it is that you had this challenge with?

**S. SLOAN:** I have it here, somewhere. I will get back on the phone when I find it.

**D. MCLEAN LEOW:** Okay. Thank you.

**P. OLYNCIW:** We kind of circumvented that difficulty. At times, the developers are more cooperative than their publishers are. And that if you go, when you see a program advertised, and you want to get information on it, and you contact the publisher, right away, they're going to try to get you into buying a certain number of copies, or a sample kit. But at times when you contact the developers, they will give you access to information, even if it's only online. We've had some pretty good cooperation with folks in regard to that, just giving us links to sites where can take a look at the pieces.

**B. SMITH:** One other suggestion is that if you could ask the developer of the program where the program is being implemented, and get the names and addresses of other sites, you may have an opportunity to have discussions with those folks, and maybe even take a look at the materials that they're using.

**L. KALTREIDER:** This is Lynn Kaltreider. Can I make a suggestion? I'm a co-developer of one of the programs—Smart Leaders. And I like that the whole time that I've been hearing people talk, I was thinking how nice it would be to know who the folks are out there who *are* implementing our program. And if there be some systematic way that that could be funneled back to the developers, it would be very helpful. If anybody has any ideas of how that could happen, I would appreciate hearing that.

**P. OLYNCIW:** This is a GRAFT Pro-, I'm just a grantee, but I remember that at the GRAFT conferences, it was pretty well delineated who was running what program. It'd probably be pretty simple to get that list back to the developers.

**L. KALTREIDER:** I just wonder who might coordinate that. It seems like either the CAPT, or CSAP, or somebody because there've been numbers of times I've been contacted, and I give information to people. And then I never know, for sure, if they actually *did* implement, or what.

**A. MATZKIN:** It sounds like you're asking about not only a single funding source and who might be—like GRAFT—and who might be implementing, based on that funding

source, but a broader idea of who might be implementing from any funding source, your particular program.

**L. KALTREIDER:** Right. It's even if the SIGs, you know, in each state there might be some way that they could funnel that information back to the developers when the grants are awarded for the state incentive grants, because even that would help.

**D. MCLEAN LEOW:** This is Deborah. Ben or Pam, can you comment on whether or not CSAP does have either a plan for, or a process in place to do exactly what is being asked?

**P. WILCOX:** This is Pam, but I think I'm waiting for Ben. I think that—and you can jump in Ben; you can tell me what you think—but I think that we don't have a process in place, but we do know that there is a need for keeping track of replication sites.

**M. GAGE:** This is Marion. I'd like to make a suggestion. One, in regards to No Child Left Behind, in the state of California, every school district had to create a local education agency plan. At least in the state of California, it is *required* if we receive Safe and Drug-Free Schools, Title IV funding, that we had to designate which *science-based* program we were going to implement, and at what grade levels. So I would assume that all of the other states in the United States who are receiving, you know, they're receiving Title IV funding, they probably were required to submit some kind of plan. I don't know if our state's the only one that went as far as *requiring* us to do science-based programs, but I think that was part of the piece of No Child Left Behind. So that is one possible mechanism is through the different state departments of education, maybe there is going to be some mechanism. And I don't know, for example, with our own state department if they're going to, actually, go through and find out who's doing what. But I do know that we are required to do an annual report. And in that annual report—which I think is available, online—you should be able to see, you know who's doing what.

Now, that brings me to my concern, in the field of prevention, in general. So in the state of California, we are now required to do these science-based programs. What happens if we don't show positive effects? So there's a big assumption, here, that these are science-based programs to ensure effectiveness. And most of us in the districts are using our Healthy Kids Survey as the measure to do that. Now, that's a big assumption, there, and certainly, some of the things that we're talking about today, we're going to have to go *back* on to have to deal with if we don't see any changes in the survey. And, again, really, I think we're on kind of a cutting edge. And we're all kind of fumbling in this together. We don't have a whole lot of guidance about how to do this, and, definitely, not a lot of resources. In my county, we could not have even gotten close to begin to implement what we were required to do without the grants that we've received. And, certainly, the grants to reduce alcohol abuse has been the best grant that I've ever been a part of, that is provide opportunities as what's been suggested for peers to talk about. Every time we meet, we have opportunities to talk about how it is going in implementing these programs. It's been the only grant that I've had experience with that's really provided that level of support. So I really appreciate that.

So, yeah, it sounds like a good idea to move forward. We know which programs are effective, but I really am concerned that there really isn't the funding resource to really make this work, especially, in light of what I'm hearing today.

**A. MATZKIN:** Thank you for the comments. I think the having some sort of informational source we can go to determine who is implementing what program would also make it a little bit easier to do the peer-to-peer review that Dr. Backer was talking about. And I can think of, also, like Marion, a few different places you could go to find some of that information. But it, certainly, is not centralized in any way.

Somebody mentioned a SIG, in particular. I'm a former SIG coordinator, and I do know that, recently, the national cross site SIG evaluation did start collecting information on exactly which programs were being implemented in each SIG site, in each SIG state, and where they were being implemented. So Wes, the evaluator could have some pieces of that information, as well, at least for *current* SIG states. I'm not sure the level to which they would have it for SIG states who have finished, already. But, again, it's not centralized in any way to get it from multiple funding sources.

**P. WILCOX:** Hey, Aurora, this is Pam Wilcox. I think that the SIG states are a good place to start. And I think that the model programs staff and the CAPTs can work together in getting that, somehow, centralized. I mean, no, we won't be able to have everything all at once. But I think that we can start to pull that information together so it's more of a readily available resource.

**A. MATZKIN:** I think, certainly, if there's anybody out there *looking* for somebody who is a peer—a like peer, as Dr. Backer described, somebody who's in similar circumstances implementing a program you're considering implementing—I think any of the CAPTs could probably help you locate somebody who's doing that program, or has done that program in the past.

**S. SLOAN:** The program that we were trying to get information on is Leadership and Resiliency Programs. So if anyone has contacts for someone who *has* implemented that. I wasn't the point person, though, contacting the curriculum developer. It's someone else in Sacramento, so, that we would like information on that program.

**P. WILCOX:** I can check that out for you. This is Pam.

**S. SLOAN:** Thanks, Pam. Appreciate it.

**A. MATZKIN:** Thank you. We still do have some other questions that were submitted, in advance. Is there anybody else who wants to jump in and ask something now? We probably have about another 20, 25 minutes left before we're going to jump into the evaluation.

Okay. I'm going to actually, we've been dancing a little bit around the program selection issue. And one of the questions submitted in advance is, '*As a substance abuse prevention person, what can I do that best serves my community for prevention? What is the best approach for intervention with adolescents after they've been identified as drug users?*' I think I'm going to ask Deb McLean Leow to jump in and talk a little bit about how do you select an appropriate intervention for your community?

**D. MCLEAN LEOW:** The Northeast CAPT spent some time, two years ago, providing technical assistance to the first grantees of SIG sub-recipient dollars. And one of the key challenges that they faced, they found that there was a rush to select programs without doing a proper assessment of how well those programs fit with their community needs, etc. I apologize. I'm actually suffering from a cold and congestion. Pardon me.

And so what we did is develop a feasibility assessment, which is a tool that we have produced. And a number of states, including Maine, have made adaptations to that tool, which allows a community or a school to look at a number of criteria, including common things like the resources that are required for implementing a particular program. Other factors include organizational and community climate. And the past history that a school may have had in working with a particular target population. Or the past history that a community or a target group may have had an interacting with a community organization. So a number of factors are, critically, important to consider, prior to selecting a program, in order for that program to be successfully implemented in a particular community.

**[END OF SIDE B]**

**D. MCLEAN LEOW:** I am happy to work with you in utilizing that tool. And, in actuality, I'd like Aurora to talk about, perhaps, the rate in which the state of Maine went about integrating that feasibility assessment into their readiness process for SIG grantees.

**A. MATZKIN:** I'll talk very briefly. I'm the *former* SIG coordinator for Maine. Maine was very fortunate to be in the fifth cohort of SIG states, which means that the program was five years into the making before Maine even really started the SIG process. We got to learn a lot from the states that went before us. And one of the things we learned was about the needs assessment process. And the needs actually spends some time in resources on selecting model programs, rather than just jumping into that process before. So, in Maine, we did give sub-recipients—after they were funded, they had six months to select their program, or *programs*. Actually, most sites did end up selecting multiple model programs. And our evaluators in Maine developed a very rigorous needs assessment process, through which all the SIG sub-recipients went. And a part of that process did, actually, involve using the Northeast CAPT's feasibility tool. We offered a couple of workshops on using that tool. We heard very positive things from some people who used that tool and were able to learn more about a program than was, necessarily, obvious by simply going to, for instance, the CSAP Model Program web site, and how that program might or might not fit their community and their organizational needs.

I think the piece that we had to emphasize over and over again is that a lot of these programs look excellent, and, clearly, have wonderful outcomes or they wouldn't be on the list. But *we* emphasized to communities, over and over again, to look at what *they* were really trying to accomplish in *their* community, specifically, and to try to find that program that had outcomes for that particular thing that they were trying to accomplish. I'll give a terrible example. But if there's a site that really wants to work on teen marijuana use—which their community has identified as a problem—it seems incredibly obvious that the program *not* to use for that is a program like Communities Mobilizing for Change on Alcohol. But we saw similar kind of mismatches, where people were looking at programs that really didn't address the core needs of their community. So we spent a lot of time in Maine trying to help people make those appropriate matches, which are not always, entirely, obvious by simply going to the model program web site. It sometimes takes some more research than that. The feasibility tools in the Northeast CAPT if really valuable in helping people identify all the information they needed to identify to make an appropriate program selection.

**D. MCLEAN LEOW:** The other issue that occurs to me is the importance of who is involved in selecting that program. I think the person who spoke from either California, or Texas, talked about the fact that their program was selected by an administrator, the administrative staff, and the folks who are currently implementing the program had no role in that selection process. I think that points out the importance of having a participatory finding process in place, where folks who are actually going to be implementing the programs and have some sense of what the needs are in that community or school have some say in the selection process. So I just wanted to reiterate the importance of that pre-planning process, having it be an inclusive and a participatory sort of process.

**R. JIMENEZ:** That was me, here in Texas. Don't get me wrong. They did do a really good needs assessment. And they took into account a lot of factors that needed to be taken into account. Unfortunately, they really couldn't hire staff or anything like that—the people who were going to be implementing—until they were going to have the funds available to do that. And I think there are a lot of people that are probably in that same situation. But what happened when they did that is the people, such as myself—that are the ones who are going to be doing the work—we weren't even *hired* until after the programs had already been decided on. And, luckily, the grant we're working under, there is some wiggle room where we can go to a different model program. Obviously, we have to get consent from different people, but it really would—if you do have the option of consulting with the people that are implementing, I think that would go a long, long way in facilitating the implementation.

And even if it doesn't, what worked for us in getting it done was, you know, we couldn't go back and re-do it, but what we did a real good job at was getting the teachers onboard, getting different people to see the importance of what we're trying to do. And once the individual schools see that there's value in what we're doing, and that the kids—the kids aren't going to do well in school if they're high; they're not going to do well in school if they're truant; they're not going to be doing well in school if they're not invested. And

once they could see that those are issues that we're going to be addressing, that we're going to be taking care of, and we're going to be trying to improve, then they start seeing the value of the program. And then they're a lot more willing to adapt the school schedule to facilitate the kids being part of our program, as well.

So I don't know, unfortunately, Demetria Cummins wasn't able to join us. But if there's another principal out there, they might be able to kind of talk about that, as well. The school, it does sometimes, have some flexibility in adapting to the program. But I know that's kind of, it's a tough thing here in Texas because of state-mandated testing, and standardized testing. So sometimes there's not much that can be done about it. But maybe the principal can kind of talk on that.

**D. MCLEAN LEOW:** This is Deborah McLean, and I want to jump in again. I think you raise a real important issue, which is often times, whether it's in the school setting or a community setting, the hiring of the implementation staff—there's a lag between when communities or schools get their funding and when they're able to hire staff. And I think that that is an issue for serious consideration for TA providers, like ourselves, and for folks who are funding these initiatives to really consider it. But the difficulty that schools and communities often have—between when they get their dollars to implement these programs, and when they're actually able to get staff onboard and prepare staff to implement the programs—I just wondered if anyone else cared to comment on that issue.

**P. OLYNCIW:** We've been successful with the number of grants in Patchogue. And we've developed a procedure on—we did it for this GRAFT grant, also where when—we get together the superintendent of schools; we have the curriculum director; we have the principals of the buildings that might be involved in the program; we have the teachers' union representative, along with the building representative from a particular building, and the superintendent of personnel. And we kind of like, sit down, take a look at the grant, what the school district's needs are in regard to that. Usually, it's something that's been identified ahead of time like we did have a school alcohol problem, as well as a community one in the proliferation of alcohol in the area. And we took a look, actually, with the GRAFT program, it was a little bit easier since the programs had been identified. So we kind of presented the various programs to the people that were at the meeting. And then started to hash over what it would take for us to implement those particular programs. We had input from John Swisher, the evaluator, as to what it would take for us to evaluate what we needed to do. And we also contacted the developers for additional information. And this not only helped us in choosing a program, but it also helped us in the implementation, once it happened. The personnel director was right there, ready to hire somebody, you know, as soon as the money did come through for us. We had a lot of the issues that [Dr.] Backer spoke of. We had a little bit of a jump on that, in that we had already involved a number of people in the process, and they had ownership in the program. Maybe can talk about Project Safe, when we did that program, that he was there when we, initially, chose the program. So it wasn't a surprise to him that, you know, when we got the grant, we said, "We got the grant. Now those things we talked about and your input we can do something about." So you develop a lot of input that way, initially, from the people. And they do have some ownership in it. He's the whole issue of union

difficulties with teacher's salaries and pays, and teachers workload. All those implementation, not saying we didn't have difficulties. You still have them. Those things still pop up, you know, after the fact. But this gave us a really good jump on things, to get that group together, initially, to take a look at the programs. Have them choose it. Have their input in it. Eliminate those programs that weren't feasible because of certain difficulties, or teacher hiring procedures, or school schedules, like yearly schedules, not just teacher schedules.

**M. SANSONE:** If I could speak at this time. I'm one of the principals, online. This is Mr. Sansone from South Ocean, in Patchogue, New York, and Phil's talking about a program. I think, really, the key ingredient for all of us—both being from schools or from outside agencies—is that we're involved for the same purpose. So we need to have that openness. And I think in our district, we were fortunate that we had that openness. And in my role, I was willing to get this program onboard, and let people develop their own ownership so whatever entity, or whatever space it went into—whatever the design was, or whatever the program was—we let that teacher, then, pretty much deal with setting that up and taking ownership of it.

Then the kids that were selected in that peer group, they then developed that part of the program. And every exemplary step along the way, there was recognition and certification. Then we can't forget that we reached out to our community, and we went out to not only the parents, but we went out to the community-based organizations to bring *them* in. And we kept involving everyone, and not just saying this was the program, you had to do this. And, yet, I think everyone can recognize that you come across hurdles. You're going to hit a hurdle every now and then, but we sat down and openly, and professionally, we tried to do our best to resolve those hurdles like Phil talked about in all those groups. And those constituents are important to be successful. And I think the only way you get a program to be successful is that everyone can talk about it and agree, you know, what can we do? What can't we do? Let's find out what's right for the students. Because we really serve the students, and them being successful. I think a lot of times, we all sit in forums, or phone conferences, and other conferences, and we seem to forget that we're doing this for the children. So I think, for us, we were fortunate, as Phil said, by getting a grant, and bringing in these programs and these components to bring discipline and structure across all the curriculums, which is what we did. We let the kids do not only news, they actually did these commercials that were aired on TV. And they just really developed such a self-esteem for themselves. I think that was the most important thing, that they were able to see themselves in another role than they had been experiencing at that time, in their life. And we continue to build on the programs that are no longer funded, because they'd existed so much in our building that everyone *expects* those [background noise] in certain months of the year. So I think that that's important, that there's follow up and continuance. So if that helps and if anybody has any other questions, I'll be more than glad to answer those.

**A. MATZKIN:** Mr. Sansone, I'm going to ask another question we received in advance which is *'How do you make the case for prevention for school administrators?'*

**M. SANSONE:** I think, initially, for myself, you know, going back a few years when I started, I bring to the attention whatever the issue is that we need to address. And I think in many school systems, they tend to not want to address an issue. And I don't know if that's the case, but you find that, you know, if there's something out there, and it may be one or two rare occurrences, they don't think it becomes an issue. But I think all of us know that when you're dealing with substance or abuse, once it starts, it escalates. And, you know, peer pressure then comes into play, and you have a multitude of kids that are now doing the same thing that we said was a rare occurrence, that we didn't address, maybe, three months ago.

But I pretty much have been open with my superintendents, and have been able to tell them look, you know, whether we had a substance abuse problem, or we had an alcohol problem, or we had other problems, these were the things that we wanted to do and how to address those. And it really takes an open forum, and some districts may not have that. I don't know if that's so with the people that are listening. We've been very fortunate to not have that in the last six, seven years that we've been doing this. Anybody else? I'm sorry.

**A. MATZKIN:** Thank you. Anybody else have another question for Mr. Sansone?

**D. MCLEAN LEOW:** This is Deborah, again, Aurora. Forgive me. But I wanted to go back to the comment that Phil made. It occurs to me that it is, probably, equally important, it occurs to me that it would be tremendously valuable for, either the CAPTs, or the model program dissemination project to, somehow, document the kind of practice that Phil and our principal from Long Island have just described, which is the pre-implementation activities, or the readiness activities that they underwent to ease the transition for their program to be implemented in the school. It occurs to me that that it is equally as important as actually choosing the right program. And I think Dr. Backer spoke to that, as well. So it's just an idea that has occurred to me, which is that we should find a way to document some of these best or promising practices for pre-implementation.

**M. GAGE:** This is Marion, again. I think what the gentlemen have described—and I concur with you that that is a great planning process model, but from my experience, that needs to be something that happens in a longer time period. For example, with the alcohol grants, we received the request for proposal, like in May, and it's due the end of June. Our school folks [laughs] were gone. So if you hadn't had the opportunity to do some previous planning, it was very difficult to access to the level that what he was describing. Definitely, I think that would help.

But that's, I think, some of the difficulties I found, where, especially, U.S. Department of Ed. grants, they, typically, seem to be on that kind of cycle where they come out in May, and they're due the end of June. So if you haven't really done some initial planning, it is very difficult to respond in the kind of way that these gentlemen described, up front. I think it is a good process to promote. And I would also say it probably wouldn't hurt to start that process to be prepared for any grant application included in your advisory



board. I think the more that school systems have done some pre-planning, the more opportunities you have to respond to grants. But that was what we ran into as not being able to get the level of teacher input *for* those grants. We had it at a principal/administrative level, but not at a teacher level. That's where we ran into some problems. But, quite frankly, if someone else said with the whole process of academic achievement, we now have standardized testing. Any prevention program you would show teachers, they would go with until you could help work with them to see how they could implement it and not impact, you know, the time they need to spend on academics.

**P. OLYNCIW:** I think you're absolutely right about when you do that pre-planning piece. But when a school district decides to pursue government grants, and that is that it's in the direction they want to take, and they know where the difficulties lie, you can start before that proposal comes out. There's a forecast of funding opportunities that comes out. There's a blurb that an alcohol grant *was* coming out. And you had the opportunity, you know, to, you have to be very proactive with this. I think that's why we've been successful with our grants, is that we see things coming down the line that we start to meet around and discuss. But you're absolutely right. We don't actually, don't write the grant with those folks. What we do is get input around the selection of particular programs that need to be made. What obstacles that we see would be in place. But those folks don't, actually, engage in going over the proposal, step by step, needs to be put in there. That's the job for the grant writers and a few of the people that engage in those activities.

**A. MATZKIN:** We are just about out of time. And I want to see if there's any last questions, quick questions, before we move on to the evaluation.

**P. OLYNCIW:** This is Phil, again. I'm sorry to take this time. But this thing that came up before about the, I'm not sure who had the, you know, from the CAPT or from whoever's on the line right now that is doing the dealing with the developers to try to get information from them, regarding fidelity of implementation issues, and what they think is important, that things that *need* to be included in a program when it's put into place. But with one of our programs awhile back was Lifeskills Training, with Dr. Botvin, that goes back about seven years with us. We saw that in his research, that he had eliminated certain groups in his research when he did it because they hadn't got to his research. That they had not implemented the program to fidelity, and they were eliminated. And we got good information from him about why he eliminated those particular groups from his research. That, coupled with the comment that Dr. Backer made about some folks are only selecting programs that have to do, that have worked to 60 percent fidelity. Is there any way to dialogue with those developers around what measurements *they* made, as to who was going to be included in their research that had run their programs to fidelity? Or what groups were *not* included within their research because of those issues, and get some information around that. Has anybody ever done that? Maybe I'm asking Ben, now, or Pam?

**A. MATZKIN:** Ben or Pam?

**B. SMITH:** Yes, this is Ben. Thanks, Phil, for that question, and it's a really good one. I was just thinking, as I was listening to you talk about kind of like the [sighs], when you're looking to investigate a program, I put myself in a position of being in a community or a school, and making an *investment* in a program, there are a whole bunch of questions that really come about.

One is the capabilities of the program to service the particular needs that you're going to have, depending on the extent of your implementation.

And the second is just that. The research that went into the development of the program, and those specific *groups* that the program was tested on, and how that actually applies. And those are questions that we are kind of pulling together, as we think about additional information that we would like to collect on *all* the developers, providing as a resource to them. And it also brings to mind the possible opportunity that we could get developers together as part of kind of a focus group to develop some dialogue among the developers and their experiences in this area.

**A. MATZKIN:** Thank you, Ben. So I don't know if you've had your questions fully answered.

**P. OLYNCIW:** Yeah, I think the fact that they're working on it, and they are looking at that because there must be some data out there that the developers has, the choices that they made, including ATLAS and ATHENA, and Dr. Goldberg spoke at length about the various trials that *he* went through during his research, and how many changes that his—he has like a 10-lesson process—the lessons changed. And they made modifications in them. It would be all that information as to what lessons they dropped, and which ones they made modifications in, and why could be very important to people in the field, because it would relate to some of the modifications and adaptations that *we* would have to make.

**D. MCLEAN LEOW:** Aurora, I'm wondering if times permits. Maybe, you'd do this in the evaluation portion, but to get suggestions from the current participants about topics that they may be interested in for future audio conferences.

**A. MATZKIN:** You know what? I will *add* that question to the evaluation questions that I'll be e-mailing to you after today. That would be an extremely good question to add. And just because I'm very cognizant of people's needs, probably, to run to one o'clock and noon and eleven AM—whatever time zone you're in—meetings. I'd like to move on with the evaluation portion of this because this is our third audio conference, and the evaluations that we've received from participants in the past have been very useful in shaping these events. And we've made some significant changes to them, as a result of people's input and responses to them. So I really want to thank everybody for participating, and *encourage you* to stay on the line to complete the quick telephone poll, which is an evaluation of this event.

In addition, I'll be e-mailing you some more open-ended questions so that we can get some more qualitative-like feedback that's very difficult to capture by pushing buttons on your phone. But before we move *into* the evaluation, I just want to thank our panel for coming together today, and answering questions, and participating in this discussion. Thank you, everybody.

**D. MCLEAN LEOW:** Thank you, Aurora.

**P. OLYNCIW:** Thanks for the opportunity.

**R. JIMENEZ:** Thank you, very much.

**A. MATZKIN:** At this time, I'm going to let the panelists go, and ask the participants for this call to please stay on the line. Again, thank you very much for the panel. I will be in touch with you over the next couple days, or early next week, with some additional information about this call. Thank you.

And at this time, I'm going to ask Kathy, who is our operator on this call, to conduct the telephone poll. Again, I want to thank everybody for participating. And Kathy, if you're there, she's going to ask you, it's about nine questions, or so. It should take only probably five minutes, or so, if that to complete this poll. And, again, your responses are really helpful for us as we plan future events. So with that, thank you!

**OPERATOR:** Thank you. And at this time, we will connect a brief electronic survey. After I finish reading the entire question and all of the possible responses, please answer by firmly pressing the star key, followed by the number on your touch tone phone that corresponds to your choice.

If you are on a speaker phone, make sure that your mute function is turned off to allow your signal to reach our equipment. There will be a brief pause between each question to allow everyone a chance to respond.

Question One. *How much new information or ideas did you receive in the workshop?* Press Star 1 for *no* new information or ideas. Press Star 2 for a *little* new information or ideas. Star 3 for *some* new information and ideas. Star 4 for a *lot* of new information and ideas.

Question Two. *How likely are you to use the information or ideas that you received in the workshop?* Press Star 1 for *not at all* likely. Star 2 for *not very* likely. Star 3 for *somewhat* likely. And Star 4 for *very* likely.

Question Three. *Overall, how satisfied are you with today's workshop?* Star 1 for *very* dissatisfied. Star 2 for *somewhat* dissatisfied. Star 3 for *somewhat* satisfied. And Star 4 for *very* satisfied. One was *very* dissatisfied. Two, *somewhat* dissatisfied. Three, *somewhat* satisfied. And four, *very* satisfied.

Question Four. *How satisfied are you with the audio conference format for providing technical assistance on this issue?* Star 1 for *very* dissatisfied. Two for *somewhat* dissatisfied. Three, *somewhat* satisfied. Four, *very* satisfied. Again, one was *very* dissatisfied. Two, *somewhat* dissatisfied. Three, *somewhat* satisfied. And four, *very* satisfied.

Question Five has three parts to it. *Please rate your satisfaction with each of the following aspects of today's workshop.*

The first one is the quality of information presented. Star 1 for *very* dissatisfied. Two, *somewhat* dissatisfied. Three, *somewhat* satisfied. Four, *very* satisfied. Again, the quality of information presented. One, *very* dissatisfied. Two, *somewhat* dissatisfied. Three, *somewhat* satisfied. And four, *very* satisfied.

Next one is the opportunity for questions and discussion. One, *very* dissatisfied. Two, *somewhat* dissatisfied. Three, *somewhat* satisfied. Four, *very* satisfied. Again, the opportunity for questions and discussion. One, *very* dissatisfied. Two, *somewhat* dissatisfied. Three, *somewhat* satisfied. And four, *very* satisfied.

Next one, *How would you rate the handouts and materials?* Star 1 for *very* dissatisfied. Two, *somewhat* dissatisfied. Three is *somewhat* satisfied. And four, *very* satisfied.

Question Six. *How many people listened to this event from your location?* Press Star 1 for one. Two is two. Three for three. Four for four. Star 5 for five. Six for six. Seven if you had seven people. Eight, if you had eight. And press Star 9 if you had nine or more.

That concludes the survey portion of the call. Thank you for participation in this conference. You will be receiving an e-mail, giving you the opportunity to provide additional feedback, shortly. Thank you.

**[END OF TAPE]**